

ANANAYIS, 1660
OR 216-2-6
Saint PETERS BONDS abide:

FOR
RHE TORICK

Worketh no
RELEASE,

Is evidenced in
A serious and sober consideration of
Dr. John Gauden's fence and solution
of the Solemn League and Covenant,
SO FAR
As it relates to the Government of
the Church by Episcopacy.

By ZECH.^{on} CROFTON.

The Second Edition.

First Edition same year

Josh. 9. 19. *We have sworne unto them by the Lord God of
Israel; now therefore we may not touch them.*

London, Printed for Ralph Smith, at the Bible in
Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange. 1660.

19.7
11.36p
x14.7cm

ANALYSIS
OF
STANFORD'S BOOKS

RHE TORIC

Worked on
RELEASE

Is evidenced in
A volume and paper consideration of
Dr. John Gaudin's sense and solution
of the Solomon Islands and Government

As it relates to the Government of
the Church by Episcopacy

By Rev. G. R. O. N.

The Second Edition.

John G. R. O. N. has been found to be a
man, and that he is not a man.

London: Printed by G. R. O. N. at the
end of the year 1841.

(1)

THE HONOURABLE THE LORDS OF THE COUNCIL OF THE KING
THE HONOURABLE THE LORDS OF THE COMMONS OF THE KING



TO THE
HONOURED
Sir LAWRENCE BROMFIELD,
Knight, and Colonel in
LONDON.

Honoured Sir,



YOU have been pleased (in order to compose of our unhappy differences) to suggest unto a grave and learned Divine, a considerable case of Conscience Relating to Church-Discipline, (*viz.*) *The consistency of Episcopacy with the Solemn League and Covenant*, and you have thereby produced his Resolution unto the *loosing of Saint Peters Bonds*, as he is pleased to Entitle it: You may Sir, remember, it is *Solomons experienced Rule*, *It is a snare (o' stumbling stone) to devoure holy things*, and after vows to make enquiry: (How to keep or retract them (saith *Mercer*) for that, indeed, many times, the Resolution proveth more entangling than the Obligation; I wish that this were not found the unhappy fate of *Dr. Gauden his sense and solution of the Covenant in point of Episcopacy.*

Truly Sir, according to that little skill that I have in things of this nature, this Resolution to your enquiry is so sadly shipwreckt on the uncertainty of the object, inadvertency of expression, and imbecillity of Answer and Argument, those three Rocks that

Pro. 20. 25.

did

lay-way conscience-satisfaction; that it cannot arrive at its desired haven; but notwithstanding its Angelical voice will leave Saint Peter as fast fettered as it found him. If Sir, I may do it without offence, I would make bold to discover it that some other attempt for Saint Peter's rescue may be undertaken.

Uncertain proposal of the object.

First, Sir, there is not a greater danger to be shunned by a *Casnist*, than a *mis'take*, or *uncertain proposal of the object*, or *Ratio formalis of the obligation* scrupled and to be discharged, which giveth occasion to the scrupulous conscience more easily to start from the most pinching Conclusions that are put upon it: and herein Sir, if I mistake not, the Dr. is very unhappy; for he compounds the object, or *Ratio formalis* of this Covenant, under the general term *Episcopacy*; the which he well knoweth, is owned as an appellation common to all and every the Governours of the Church, who are in Scripture denominated *Bishops*; and by good demonstration *Bishop* and *Presbyter* have been asserted to be synonymous titles of Church-Officers, and are found to have been so used in the Primitive times of the Church, and Writings of the Fathers; and in this sense the *Episcopacy* which he supposeth to be the object of the Covenant, intends only the Government of the Church by the Ministers and Officers thereof, who may, and must in their several Assemblies (*ordinis causa*.) have a President or Moderator, to regulate and dispose all things which belong to Order; as in all policy to the Chair belongeth; and if this be it he means by his *Episcopacy*, *Primitive, Regular, Reformed, and paternal Episcopacy*: which I could easily imagine when I observe the Emphasis of his universal discrete *All Episcopacy*, page 9. and elsewhere often mentioned, and that in an opposition to *some Episcopacy* abjured and fit to be extirpated; and that it is explained by the adjuncts, *Reformed and Regulated as it ought to be*, as page 8. and opposed to an *Episcopacy* the confessed Subject of *abusive excesses and defects*, not only in the execution of its authority, through the faults and infirmities of some Bishops and their instruments; who possibly were not so worth and good; or not so wise, and discreet, as became Christian Bishops, and Ecclesiastical Governours of Christ's Church; but also in the very inconvenience of its Constitution and Customs in England, page 10. In both

Acts 20.28.

The true sense of Episcopacy consistent with the Covenant.

both which he confesseth, page 21. there needeth an honest and ingenuous Reformation of Episcopacy, beyond the former excesses, or defective constitution, or execution of it: And more particularly by that Explication which is annexed in page 14. The efficacious conjunction of it with Presbytery according to the Reduction of the most reverend Primate of Armagh, and the considerations of the Lord Verulam offered to King James: If I say, this be the Episcopacy he means, I humbly conceive in his Book he doth sudare de nugis, labour to little purpose; for so farre is any intelligent Covenanter from looking on their looking back, to the Primitive, Catholick, and Universal government, of this, or any other ancient Churches; to endanger the turning of them into Pillars of Apostacy, as Lots wife was into a Pillar of Salt, that they judge an arrival at it, to be their Zoar in their escape from Sodom; and hereof he might have assured himself by what (page 22.) he professeth himself to know to have been the sense of the Learned men in the late Assembly of Divines, and by Mr. Marshal's Declaration, that the Covenant was leavelled at the *Dispoicum Tyrannicum Regimen*; there are no Covenanters that know any thing of the true nature of Presbytery, but they will embrace this Episcopacy as not only consistent with, but the very complement of the Covenant as to that point and Article; and will confess this is not only the honest, but literal and complexive meaning of it, and with him will condemn them for rigid Bigots and virulent spirits, to be frighted, not driven with, who conceive themselves bound against such a Primitive, Reformed, and Regular Episcopacy under such a reduction (as I conceive) would prove the formal corruption of the Episcopacy covenanted against, and I hope he will find few, very few such covenanters in England.

But if Sir, by Episcopacy he mean (as I must confess I am jealous he doth) that frame and fabrick by which the man of sin was made manifest, did advance himself in the Temple of God, above (not only all his fellow Ministers or Bishops) but even Magistrates, all that were called God; which was, by his appearance and exaltation, innovated into, and obtruded on the Churches of God in these Nations, on the fall of the Monks of Bangor, and was so exercised, that Anselm (whom Laude succeeded, as in place, so in property, and almost power) did

The vulgar and late acceptance of Episcopacy repugnant to the Covenant.

appear *papa alterius mundi*; wherein Bishops as a species or kind of Ministers different and distinct from Presbyters; and so Superior to them, not only in point of Order, but Office and Authority, together with all that *Hierarchy* by which it was executed; all which his terms do too plainly suggest when he speaks of the *Episcopacy which England sometimes had; was lately destroyed, the legal Episcopacy*, pag. 19. an *Episcopacy wherein the Bishops are distinct from Presbyters*, pag. 21. arrogate unto themselves the sole power of *Ordaining Ministers*, and to be the chief *Conservators, Cisterns, and Conduits* of Ecclesiastical authority, and Ministerial power, pag. 12. who have not only Precedency and Order, but *paternal authority*, pag. 18. and that not only over people, but their *Pastors*; who are by this antithesis *fraternal* with them, and so *filial* to the *paternal* power of the Bishops; and make up the *paternal, fraternal, and filial unity of Bishops, Presbyters, and people*, pa. 5. Nay, in opposition to whom the ordinary Minister or Presbyter, is divested of all power, and degraded of all dignity among the people; and the Bishop, as dignified above him, so distinguished from him by his Lawn sleeves, which is plainly suggested when he tells us, *The people of England are not to be governed by their equals and inferiors, because they are in black Coats*, pag. 17. All these expressions, with many of the like nature, do seem to set up and point out such an Episcopacy, as is not Primitive and Regular: And I say, if this be the meaning of his Episcopacy, as the word (in the vulgar acceptance by the too long appropriation of it to such an unjust and Anti-christian frame of Government) may be understood: Truly Sir, then I must be free to tell him the sense and very Letter of the Covenant is clear against it, and binds the taker in terminis to the extirpation of Prelacy, that is to say, the Government by Arch-Bishops, Bishops, their Chancellors, and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Arch-Deacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers depending on that Hierarchy: So that it is the thing, not its abuse; the subject, not its adjuncts; the Fabrick, not its defects and excesses, is covenanted against, nor will the Covenant be accomplished, or the conscience be satisfied by the removal of the *pride, presumption, idleness, covetousness, and tyranny of Bishops*, whilst the pre-

preheminence, prerogative, paternal power, and juridical authority, assumed by them as distinct from and above all other Ministers of the Gospel, as the only immediate Successors of the Apostles, and enforced by their High Commission and Stat-chamber with other imperial Courts, Officers, and proceedings are continued and established; nor must he think by his Sophistical comparison, to deceive and delude the conscience, telling us, page 17, 18. *That, they that Covenanted against Popery, cannot think they did abjure, or must abhorre all those saving truths and duties of Christianity, which are mixed with Popery*, for whatsoever is formal popery, though it be an English Mass or Altar, that, all that, though only that, must be abhorred; and I conceive it yet remains to be proved that the paternal authority of Episcopacy is a saving truth or Christian duty, or not of the formality of prelacy; and clearly intended in the word *Hierarchy*, Chief-Priest-hood, as the principle of all the unjust power and p[re]tority assumed and exercis'd over other Ministers; and so that very government covenanted against. It is no hard case of conscience to resolve whether a man may use the good and substantial materials of a destroyed Fabrick; but I conceive it an high fallacy, from thence to impose the very form resolved against.

You see Sir, at what uncertainty we are left, whilst the object of the obligation is propounded under a general term, whose proper, primitive, and genuine signification, suggests one thing, and the vulgar and long-used acceptance suggests another: and our resolution is darkened by the multitude of expressions, concluding sometimes one; and sometimes the other thing; which of these shall a conscientious Covenanter embrace? You cannot Sir, but know, the work of a Casuist, is, to be full, and clear in the discovery of the *Ratio formalis*, thing or matter; concerning which the conscience conceiveth it self obliged; and that it is a great unhappiness in an Interpreter, and much greater in a Casuist, to resolve *obscura per obscuriora*.

But Sir, that I may testify my willingness to understand him, and cement what in me lieth, the sad differences in the Church; Shall I intreat you, will please to provoke the Doctor, and his Anti-covenant-Brethren, such as seem to advance and promote an Episcopacy scrupled by Covenanters; to speak out, and clearly

Presbyterial
Episcopacy
admitted.

to declare, whether they will admit the removal of the Government by Arch-Bishops, and that late Hierarchy; which he concludes, page 18. is dead, and must rise in another quality; and (according to what is suggested in the *Reduction* by him urged) consent to the establishment of Congregational, Classifical, Provincial, and National Assemblies, or Synods of Church-Officers; *Communi concilio Presbyterorum*; to debate and determine the affairs of the Church, and exercise all Acts of discipline and Ecclesiastick power: In each of which if there be *Ignatius* his *Angel*, *Tertullian* his *Summus sacerdos*, or *Armagh's Bishop* or *Super-intendent*, for order-sake to call Assemblies, propound questions, gather suffrages, require Order and composure in audience and debate, pronounce sentence, and sign Decrees, and to be fixed in that place, enjoying all the dignities thereto belonging, and to be distinguished by some special denomination from his Chorepiscopi or Colleagues; they shall not only enjoy my consent (who I hope make conscience of the Covenant) but also endeavour (which I think will not much need) that all the Covenanted Ministers may joyn with them in a Petition to His Majesty, that by a Synod (by His Majesties Authority) called, it may be speedily consulted and concluded on; under which I doubt not but the Peace of the Church will be preserved, and power of truth and godliness be promoted.

Domineering
Prelacy refused

But if nothing will serve them but Bishops, distinct in order and office from Presbyters, and exercising over them a paternal authority; appropriating to themselves the power of ordaining Ministers, and the succession to the Apostles, and the Jurisdiction before noted; we must intreat him to produce those clear, pregnant, and constant beams of right reason, and true Religion, which shineth in the brightness and stability of Divine and Humane Laws; which may be the pillars of this truth, firm supports of duty, sure bonds of obedience, and safe repose of conscience in this point; greatly darkned by the many disputes of Bishops and Presbyters; Papists and Protestants; nay, by the positive assertions of both Papists and Protestant Divines; and determinations of Schoolmen, who have concluded *Bishops and Presbyters to be Ministers ejusdem ordinis, equal in office and authority*, and in this very case of government; all which his very *Reduction* proposed doth not obscurely suggest. Sir, the

conscience is (by him confessed) to be more tender, than to be deluded with Sophistry, or silenced by a pretence of Regulation and Moderation, which intends no other, save a Reduction of Episcopacy to its pristine and corrupt estate, not unto Presbytery.

Thus Sir I have noted the first Rock, and the Doctor's unhappy dashing against it; which must needs render ineffectual, whatever he after writeth.

The inadvertency of his expressions will appear no lesse evident, than his ambiguous state of the Scruple, and its resolution of expression on; if we either observe its fierceness or falsehood: The fierceness of it is much manifested in those multiplied invectives uttered against the Covenant and authority which did enjoy it; and persons who did compose it; in these and the like intemperate terms, "a stratagem of State, a Flag of Faction, an engine framed of purpose to batter down Episcopacy, page 13. Fierce expressions. Covenants, complement, and Reformings of bungling Reformers, page 24. The petty composition of a few politick men, Subjects, not Princes, and very mean Subjects 100, some of them, either as Lawyers or Ministers, a great part of whom, I and others well know to be no very great Clerks, or Statesmen, fitter for a Countrey cure, than to contrive Solemn Leagues and Covenants; whose heads, rather than their hearts; and their State Correspondencies, more than their consciences brought forth the Covenant, page 11. The effect of Scottish importunities, English compliances, and Presbyterian insolencies, page 5. brought forth by the Midwifery of Tumults, and Armies, engaged and enraged parties, and factions; whose wrath and policy were not probable to work the righteousness of God; evil Angels turning our waters into blood, page 6, 7. These and many the like Railing, Taunting, and Intemperate terms, much below the expected sobriety of a so publicly professed healer of Englands wounds: yet as an evidence of his fury, he falsely chargeth the Covenant with most sad and unblest effects, and to have been the cause of all the "havocks in Church and State, improsperties, disorders, confusions, contempts, wars, spoils, bloodshed, upon all estates, and degrees, contempt of Religion, and neglect of Sacraments, page 7. One of the great Rocks
B "for

"for the King's shipwrack, no lesse then the Churches and States; and that it was watered with the King's blood. pag. 8. I cannot but wonder to find Dr. Gawden thus *audacter calumniare*! for can any considerate Reader, or competent observer of the transactions of our Nations in these last years, reade these reproachfull speeches, and not conclude them a *most positive and publick calumny*? Let the Covenant it self be considered, and can it, by reason of any tendency in it self, be charged to be the *proper cause* of such prodigious effects? Is it not the most *feruent profession* of piety towards God, *Loyalty* to the King, and *Justice* towards men, that can be made? Is it not the most *firm tie* to Religion that can be fastned; and the *fullest security* of all kinde of Interests, the prerogative of the King, the Priviledges of Parliament, and Liberty of the Subject, which can be given? can any thing but ill-will represent to the world such *unblest effects* as the natural products of it? and if some persons engaged in it, have engaged in and acted such horrid impieties, inhumane and barbarous actions, under the false cry of the Covenant, shall a man of justice, charge the bastard-brood of such prophane-ness, to be the natural issue of so Solemn and Sacred an Oath!

But Sir, will not an observation of the time, when these sad and unblest effects fell upon us, acquit the Covenant from being in the least necessary unto the production of them? If my observation faile me not, and I be not mistaken in my account, the Confusion before the Covenant, throwing stools at the heads of the Bishops in Scotland, the pulling down the Star-Chamber and High Commission Courts (those grand supports of Prelatical Power) the taking away the Bishops Votes and Session in Parliament: The preparations against Scotland, (by Bishop Peirce his *Bellum Episcopale*) the tumults about Lambeth, the imprisonment of the Bishops in the Tower, the tumults about Whitehall and Westminster, with his late Majesties departure from the two Houses, the setting up his Majesties Standard, the alarms of War, with many battels and blood-shed; the violence of the vulgar against the Liturgy, Crosses, and Altars, with all that confusion and disorder which attended our first unhappy differences, are of some years date before the Covenant was imposed; or so much as devised, or digested; all which

which were not only begun, but carried to some considerable progress before it had its being; how then could these be the black shadows of its appearing and prevailing in England?

Some have observed, that from the time of the taking of the Covenant, success fell on the side of the Parliament, and things did thenceforward grow into a tendency to peace, and rested not untill it effected the Resolves that *His Majesties Concessions* were satisfactory and sufficient ground of peace. And here let it be noted that it was so far from being watered with the King's blood, that when the debate (relating to His Majesty) engaged the Contests in the House, which run the Armies on those high insolencies against the Parliament, as to pull out violently 120. Members, who in conscience of the Covenant, did pursue and struggle for His Majesties *Restitution* with honour and happiness, And the Covenant was by that perfidious pack openly declared useless, an Almanack out of date, and violated with the highest impiety imaginable, to make way to that execrable murder of his most Sacred Majesty: Nay Sir, can the clamours of the Covenant (which were so loud in Press and Pulpit, by the Ministers of London in their Representations to the Armies at Saint Albans (before they perpetrated their horrid designs) in their publick *Vindication* Printed with their names subscribed, witnessing to the World the inconsistency of that *Barbarous* proceeding with the Solemn League and Covenant,) be so far out of the Doctor's remembrance, as to charge the Covenant (so Eminently approved the pillar of witness against it) to have been the Rock of the King's shipwreck, and watered with his blood? Your Casuist was willing to have all the world to know * his innocency as to that inhumane wickedness; methinks Sir, he should not quite over-look others no lesse innocent than himself.

Covenant con-
test against the
King's death.

* Reprinting
his own pro-
test against it.

Moreover Sir, many that are no Rigid Bigots, or virulent spirits, and have considered the concurrence of affairs in this Church, and Kingdom, think, that without breach of charity or sobriety, they may conclude the arrogance of Prelates, the alterations of publick worship, the innovated Ceremonies and Superstitions, the Oath (with its etcetera) binding to Canonical obedience, the excommunications, banishments, stigmatising, Confiscations, imprisonments, and high Commission-Cer-

The more likely
cause of our
late confusi-
ons.

asures against pious Non-conformists, with the silencing and suspending painfull, powerfull and pious Preachers, with the Arbitrary, Illegal imposition of the new Service-Book in Scotland, look much more like the natural parent, and proper cause of our late Confusions, Commotions, War, and Bloodshed, then doth the Solemn League and Covenant; but I intend not to retort or recriminate.

I shall Sir, leave wise men to judge, how unlikely a course it is, by such *unadvised expressions*, to satiate conscience; which is so tender and tickle, that all offences should be avoided; passion is not only a perturbation to the mind, but also a prejudice to the understanding of what is propounded; the answer had need be clear, and arguments convincing, that follow such provocations unto prejudice; which would make a sober (much more a scrupulous) conscience turn aside and read no further; when conscience is so tender that reason is ready to pinch it into passion, how little need is there to provoke it by Railings and reflexion of just miscarriages? (much less unjust calumnies.) Though Ironies and Satyrs may become Oratours in reproof; they beseeem not Casuists in the resolution of conscience-doubts.

The imbecillity of his answer and arguments, the third Rock of conscience-resolution.

But I proceed to consider his answer and Arguments, purposing, by Gods grace, to yield to the power of Reason that is in them, though they come under so great disadvantages as have been noted.

His indirect answer considered.

His Answer is as himself suggesteth, double, indirect, and direct.

His first Answer is indirect, and oblique stroak at the whole body of the Covenant, which work, how prudently it is undertaken, considering the universall obligation of the Covenant on all men from His Sacred Majesty, to the meanest Subject, let wise men judge? and how proper to him; who (if my information faile not) is himself engaged in it. It is indeed a not ble piece of policy under pretence of Reconciling the Covenant in one Article to Episcopacy, to invalidate the whole, and expose it to vulgar contempt; but if it be sinfull, let it go: His Rhetorick is Angelical, but let us try the strength of his Reasons, unto the loosing of St. Peters bonds.

The main strength of what he doth suggest against the Covenant, lieth in the *miscarried Circumstances* which do relate unto the imposing, and taking of it; (*viz.*) its *defect* in point of imposing power; the *terror and tumults* with which it was enforced; the *policy and humour* from whence it did arise; and the *novelty or unacquaintedness* of it as to our English Laws and Constitutions, or the like: Unto all which I shall only desire the Dr. on serious and second thoughts, to give a candid; clear, rational, and Scriptural resolve, to this general *Case* of Conscience. (*Viz.*) if an Oath, Vow or Covenant, containing in it matter *good and lawfull*, (though not necessary and positive duty) be imposed by fraud; (as was that of the *Gibeonites*) or force, and *factious, Army, and tumults* (as that of *Zedekiah to Nebuchadnezzar*) without any formal authority, other than a mans or peoples own voluntary Act and submission, which is new unto, and *unacquainted* with the Laws and Constitutions accustomed in the place, and to the people, and in something repugnant to Gods direction be by reason of any, or all these miscarried Circumstances, *void and null*? I am much mistaken if he cross not the common resolution of Divines and Casuists, if he conclude the Affirmative; but let us consider his suggestions singly, and so we shall best try their strength.

The general scope of his arguments.

And his first on-set begins with an *I might shrewdly batter the Covenant*, and so he assaults it with that, which (I must confess) is indeed a battering Ram; and being admitted, will endanger to beat down all that hath been done in this Kingdom since 1641. arrainging, censuring, and condemning all the proceedings of the two Houses of Parliament; in which, I shall leave his prudence and discretion to be judged by such, as are sensible how far his Majesties Honour, the Kingdoms satisfaction and establishment in the desired peace, is endangered by so much as a Dispute thereof: But the strength of it lieth in this, the *defectiveness* of (and so the invalidity of the Covenant) *as to any lawful, constant, or compleat authority, capable to bind the Subjects and people of England, in any Court of Conscience or Judicature, in which nothing can have any permanent bond, or tie in Law, except Gods Word without the Kings consent, as the vow of a servant, son, daughter or wife, &c.*

First argument, the Covenants defectiveness as to authority, page 6.

This

This I must confess is a fierce assault, and specious argument ; yet methinks I finde a Covenanter fortified against its force, by the Wool-sacks of these considerations.

First, The *two Houses of Parliament* (and those two had more then ordinary power) are co-ordinate, and sharers in the Legislation of England ; and so a constant, lawful Authority : It is Sir, worth your Observation, how warily in page 18. your Casuist binds the King to protect and preserve his *Episcopacy*, but barrs his change of it, without the counsel and desire of the two Houses whom he judgeth Propitious to it.

Secondly, *This Covenant was ordered by the Parliament during their Session* : And although I will not determine, that an Order or Ordinance of one or both Houses, can have the force and permanent tie of a Law (which yet among us will admit a dispute by the ablest Lawyers, and many purchasers will plead for with vigour) yet I think it will not be ordinarily denied, that it may lay the Subjects under a permanent bond ; and I conceive, these are terms very different ; that is a bond on Conscience, which is not not a Law and Tie in Judicature : Orders of Parliament, directing an Act presently to be executed, will not I hope be denied obedience ; or the execution be voided by the after Dissolution of it, especially where it is in its own nature permanent and abiding. An Oath is in it self, *natura rei*, a permanent bond ; once laid it ever binds ; a Parliament are a power sufficiently compleat to impose and enjoin it ; if they see cause to bring a Colledge or Corporation under any special Oath, by an Order during their Session, I hope no Englishman will question their Authority ; nor Divine deny the Obligation of the Oath ; nor the one or other determine this tie to be discharged ; when the Parliament is dissolved.

Thirdly, *The supposed defect hath been since supplied* ; and His Majesties consent or assent fully expressed, by His swearing the same Solemn League, and by Oath promising His Royal Assent to all Acts and Ordinances enjoyning the same ; and by His Royal Declaration of the 16th of August, 1650. declaring His full perswasion of the justice and equity of every the Heads and Articles of the Solemn League and Covenant ; and so far,

ju.

justifying the taking of it by His Subjects, that He graciously professeth to know no friends but the friends of the Covenant; and no enemies but the enemies of the Covenant: Hereby, whatever defect was in the first imposing of it, is fully made up to fasten it on the people now it is taken; so that by reason of this subsequent Act, I may say if by Moses he will be judged, to Moses he shall go; and admitting his parallel (which some doubt, will not in this case square) if the Father, Master, Husband, in the day that he beareth the vow of the Wife, Child; or Servant, hold his peace, (contradict it not) much more if He justifie, allow, and commend it, as His most Sacred Majesty hath done, on most serious and deliberate thoughts, in a most publick and solemn Declaration, it shall stand, and be established.

But Sir, suppose the Dr. can pull down this defence, and manage his battery, so as to make a breach on the Covenant; yet before he enter, I must sound a parlee with him; and desire him to tell us whether the *quod fieri non debuit, factum valet*, pleaded to defend the wanton Baptisme of Children, and hasty Baptisme of Women, be not more really pleadable in our case: To make the worst of it, "a tumultuous Assembly convene, and come before us with Sword and Scepter, and say "they are a Parliament, and have lawfull, constant, and command authority, to command us; and therefore will put an "Oath and Covenant upon us; and silly, inconsiderate we, are "not so well skill'd in politicks, or acquainted with the constitutions of our Country, to detect their fallacy, but think all "authority is within those walls, and obedience must be yielded "to what is there commanded, and so we are beguiled into the "Oath; May we thence cry out A Cheat? and so cast off the "Covenant? and conclude it cannot binde? I doubt such Doctrine embraced will expose us to a three yeares Famine,

His first battery was so fiercely made, that it recoileth with a more than an ordinary Rumour; and makes him enforce it, *pa. 6.* with an *I might Eccho* (as indeed he hath done, for I find no certain sound in what he saith) *the violence and noise of those times in which it was batched in England, and brought forth by*
the

Violence of
times.

the midwifery of tumults, and armies, of engaged, yea, enraged Parties and Factions; All which, it is well known, was not so great or loud, but that the Lords and Commons in Parliament, the Commissioners of the Kirk and Kingdom of Scotland, with an Assembly of grave and Learned Divines, did after Solemn Humiliation, and seeking God, serious consultation, and sober debates, digest and determine the Covenant; and both matter and form doth bespeak it to have been no rash or preposterous product of Fancie: But suppose the worst; will the violence of the times put a nullity and non-obligation on the Oath? How comes the sentence to be so severe against Zedekiah? He hath despised the Oath, and broken the Covenant, he shall not escape, Ezek. 17. 18. Was not this Oath extorted by Armies without, and tumults within? and yet is it so austere binding? whatever Turks, Papists, or Politicians say, shall a Christian and Protestant suggest a nullity of the Oath, because of the violence of the times in which it was taken?

His next suggestion is a sound no lesse uncertain; he saith he might urge the novelty and partiality of the Covenant as to the English Laws and Genious: That he might, and might when he hath urged it, explain it; for the matter of it is neither new, nor partial; it hath been often heard, and endeavoured in England; in the very point of Episcopacy, the removal of Englands Hierarchy hath been sued for from * Queen Elizabeths time, downward unto this day: and the Covenant secures all Interests without partiality; his surmise of forrain influence, invasion, and obstruction, calls for proof; and then it will but little relieve him; for an Oath enforced by forraign Conquest, or couzenage: new to the Nation, and contrary to its Lawes, binds the conscience: and the supposed contrariety of the Law, is of no force to them, who conclude a Power in the Parliament to put a period to those Lawes, and a Solemn Oath or Covenant sworne by the Legislators, and by them put on the people, seem to be the most full discharge of all seeming-contrary Lawes that can be imagined; especially when the Royal assent is publicly given to it.

His fourth suggestion in his indirect answer. He proceeds, It might seem odious, to reflect upon the Covenant, as to the effects, and unblest consequences, which like black shadows, have attended its appearing

* Witness Dr. Whiters Epistle to Laude before his trial of the Sabbath.

ring and prevailing in England; what havocks *improvements*.
 &c. as before we have noted: This Reflection I confess,
 cannot but seem *odious*; but not to the Covenant, unless these
 sad effects, and unblest consequences, be found to attend it,
 as its proper brood and naturall issue, not accidental sequels,
 produced by its genuine tendency to them, not by wicked
 mens reluctance to order and piety, or perfidy as to what
 they had covenanted; but the *odium* will of its own accord re-
 flect on him who is a *Covenanter*, and yet exposeth his So-
 lemn League and Covenant to vulgar scorn and contempt;
 who is a man of justice and sobriety, and yet calumniateth the
 Covenant with those sad effects which had their being and pro-
 gress before the Covenant it self. Sure he dreams, that seeth
 the shadow, before the substance is in being; and who is a Di-
 vine detesting the plea of *success* as the Judge or Rule of any
 cause, and yet maketh it the measure of the Solemn League and
 Covenant.

Nor can his next suggestion be considered unto the encrease
 of his credit; in which he tells us, *He will not insist on the*
bassings of the Covenant, before it was adult or many years
old; how it was soon made a Nebuchadnezzar, and reduced to no-
thing by counter and cross engagements after it had served as
one of the great Rocks for the King's shipwreck, and been wa-
tered with the King's blood, &c.

5th Suggestion
 in his indirect
 answer. p. 7.

Truly Sir, had I been at your Doctors elbow when he wrote
 this, I would have advised him to have been so far from *insisting*,
 that he should not have inserted this, which he calls *Bassing of the*
Covenant: For Sir, will not every one cry shame, that shall
 hear him say the Covenant was one of the great Rocks which
 shipwrecked the King? and the Covenant was watered with the
 King's blood? Who can consider the King's reluctance to the
 Covenant was not so much as inserted into His Charge, nor once
 taken notice of by Bradshaw, amongst those many reasons by
 him produced, to justify that most execrable Sentence pro-
 nounced against Him? Who observeth the *Resolves of the Par-*
liament, that his Majesties Concessions (though He refused the
 Covenant) were satisfactory? and that until the faithful Co-
 venanters were pulled out of the House by military violence,
 and the Band of the Covenant broken by the raging lusts of

Some proud perjured Apostates, there neither was nor could be the least proceeding against His Most Sacred Majesty, and yet conclude Him shipwrackt by the Covenant? because some that had taken the Covenant did perpetrate that wickedness, will any Rules of Justice or Religion charge it on the Covenant? because the Covenant was violated by force, suppressed by power, and slighted by policy, was it therefore vacated? when? by whom? or with what Arguments of Right reason, or Religion, was it ever baffled? was not its vigour made visible by the *London Ministers Representation and Vindication*? was not its bound on conscience made legible by the *Lancashire and Cheshire plea for Non-subscribers*, and the testimonies of the Ministers in the several Counties of *England*, published with their names subscribed? and was it not indeed Imprinted by the *invasion and devastation of Scotland*? the *Sequestration and sufferings* even unto imprisonment and death of many in *England*, pursuing His Majesties restitution on the account of the Covenant? How can the Doctor confess, *Doubtless the sense of the Covenant hath lately quickned many mens consciences in their allegiance to the King, so as to bring Him (as David) home with infinite joy and triumph*, page 25. and yet here complain that it was so easily vacated in point of its express *Loyalty for the Kings preservation*? If it were ever vacated, when, or how was it renewed and re-inforced? If I may speak it without vanity, had not the firm bond of the Covenant vigorously contended in the point of Loyalty, against the violent powers which bare it down, His late Majesties Martyrdom had not broken forth with such lustre; nor His now Majesty (whom God long preserve) been restored to that estate of Honour in which we now enjoy Him; so that the Antecedent of this suggested Argument will be most positively denied.

But if we should admit it, I cannot but wonder to hear a *Divine* say and inferre upon it; *If it were so easily vacated in point of Loyalty, I do not see, how it can be so binding against Episcopacy*: I think it to be no good Logick and worse Divinity, from some mens *evasion, and violation*, to infer a *vacation and non-obligation*; or from a *vacation* of it in one point, to infer its *non-obligation* as to others, sin, indeed is apt but it must not be allowed to engender sin; by God grace gradu-

all violation shall not effect in me a total rejection of the Covenant.

His sixth suggestion seems indeed to be of more force than the former (*viz.*) *The Covenant* (if so interpreted) must needs grate sore upon, and pierce to the quick, those former lawfull Oaths, which had prepossessed the souls and consciences of most of us in England; not onely of Subjects, as those of Allegiance and Supremacy, besides that of Ministeriall, Canonically obedience to our lawfull Superiours, but even the conscience of the late King as bound by his Coronation-Oath, &c. From which Oaths, as we know no absolution, so neither can there be any superfetation of such a contradictory vow and Covenant without apparent perjury: To which I offer to consideration.

6th Suggestion
in his 7th rect
answer p. 8.

That the dissatisfaction of His late Majesty of Blessed Memory, (and in nothing more blessed, than in the conscience He made of the Oath of God upon Him, and the charge He hath left His now glorious Majesty, That if God brought Him to His own Right on hard conditions, He should be carefull to perform what he should promise) that is now beyond dispute; and His Majesty that now is, not onely free from those Fetters which restrained His Royal Father, but also is engaged in the same League and Covenant, and this supposed contradiction cast out of doors.

And as to the contradiction of the Covenant to the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy, non constat, it appears not; nor would it ever (as it hath done) have quickned the hearts of some, to suffer for, and to struggle under their Loyalty, untill His Majesties Honorable Restitution, if it were so repugnant to them: Let its contradiction in this point be noted, and we shall speak to it.

And as to that of Canonical obedience to our lawful Superiours, its contradiction is suggested with an *If it be so interpreted*; Let the interpretation be cleared, before the contradiction be concluded and argued; for if that Oath did binde an obedience to Bishops as an Hierarchie and invested with paternall authority, and as a distinct and superiour order of Ministry, and its unexplained *et cetera* included more; a grating upon, and piercing to the quick this Oath, was no other but duty; and then the Argument is of no more force, save to speak the fretting of their spirits, who foolishly sware they know not what, and now desire to maintain it, more for fancy, than

conscience; for it is not yet proved that such are lawful superiors in Church or State.

His seventh Answer or Argument, is *ab incommodo*, the inconvenience (which must be very great and visible if it discharge an Oath) and here he tells us, *It must needs run us upon a great Rock of not only Novelty but Schisme, &c.* Unto which I desire Sir, you will please to observe.

1. The loss we are at by the uncertainty of the object, he turgeth this Argument with his universal discrete, *all Episcopal order and government.* We must Sir, have a clear Notion of Episcopal Order and Government, before we can with care shun the Schism; nor is it explained to us by the general terms of Practice and Judgement of the Catholick Church in all ages and places till of latter dayes; for we know, that superiority and paternal power over other Bishops and Ministers, did too soon appear, and too universally spread after the Apostles days, unto the advancement of the man of sin, though it prevailed not without great reluctancy, and its removal hath been aimed at and endeavored by the Reformation.

Again, must we take it for granted, that conformity is essential to communion with the Church? and agreement in discipline unavoidably necessary to union? Certainly if so, we must make the very form of Discipline an Article of our Creed: And truly Sir, the *jus divinum*, or Apostolical institution of the form he seems to plead for, lieth too much in the dark for such a conclusion; and therefore the most himself tells us of it is, That it looks like an immediate institution of Christ, *preceptive and explicite, or facite and exemplary*, pag. 13. but he knows not whether; yet well knows, *simile non est idem*; and therefore he here calls it but an ancient tradition and universal observation; and then the 34th Article of the Church of England secureth us from this Rock of Schisme, whilst it teacheth us, *It is not necessary that traditions be in all places one and utterly alike, &c.* In Politicks (we well know) different forms of Administration are consistent with union in the same Kingdom, and Communion in the same Government; It is no strange thing to see Corporations in England governed by their twelve Jurors, without a Mayor and Court of Aldermen, but it would be thought very strange from thence to charge

charge them with sedition! and it must be a *jus divinum*, and immediate institution, not *Apostolical tradition*, or *Universal observation*, must bar us from the priviledges, any more than the distated properties common to all policy.

Moreover Sir, if this form of Discipline (*which be notesb some few Reformed Churches of later dayes want, though they do not condemn, but approve and venerate in others*) be so necessary a Nerve, that the abjuration and exclusion of it runs us on such a Rock of Schisme, I see not how those Churches (though *their want be through necessity of times, and distress of affairs, put upon them*) can be owned in the union of the Catholique Church; for essentials unto union must not onely be revered in others, but enjoyed by themselves.

It is Sir, worth enquiry, what he means by the *Catholique Church*; for besides the vulgar appropriation of it to *Rome*, and affixtion our late Prelates had to that term, his Note *That the abolishing of Episcopacy, is no small wall of partition newly set up to keep all Papists from due Reformation*, makes me jealous the *Cassandrian* accommodation is yet in the Bishops intention and endeavors; upon which they would not put that reproach, scandal, scruple, or affront, as to be without Bishops of *paternal authority*; but if so, happy is that Church whose Reformation carrieth them furthest off *Romes* Superstition, in discipline, and worship, as well as doctrine.

His eighth Answer or Suggestion is a Rhetorical *swada*, and insinuating plea, which hath wholly lost its force by the uncertainty of the object: *If conscience be erroneous*, we shall easily grant that it is *equal, and ingenuous, Loyal, and Religious*, to *reduce and confine it*; which yet must not, and will not be straiter than the proper and genuine sence of the Covenant will admit; but as for that *extravagant, disloyal, unlawful, erroneous, and Schismatical sence*, against which he declaimes, in which it could neither be lawfully taken, nor honestly kept; it must be determined by an Explication of his *All-Episcopacy*, and full demonstration of a sence so qualified, before there can be any more strength in this Rhetorick, than in his Reasons: I must Sir, be free to tell him again, the Covenant doth expressly binde against the *Fabrick*, and very form of the late Hierarchy in *England*, not its *abuses, excesses, or defects* onely: though not

against the use of any thing which was good, and fit to be used in the succeeding form to be established; nor do I understand it to be such an unreasonable and irreligious (*Ametrie*) transport for men to Covenant against all the right use of things that are good (but not necessary) because of the abuse incident to them, as he doth suggest, though the Covenant is not guilty of such obligation: But more of this in his direct Answer.

The Covenant authority proved, not only pretended by examples in the old Testament.

Having assaulted the Covenant with his fierce battery, and alarmed it with his frightful Echoes, he proceeds to level to the ground all those fair, but fallacious pretences (as he deemes them) drawn to fortify the Covenant from Scriptures examples, wherein the Jewes sometimes solemnly renewed Covenant with God, &c. And the main and onely Morterpiece he lets lie, is, That it was that express Covenant which God himself had first made with them in Horeb and Mount Sinai, punctually prescribed by God to Moses, and by Moses (as their Supreme Governour or King) imposed upon them; this they sometime renewed after they had broken it by their Apostacy to false and strange gods: Unto the enforcement whereof, we must desire the Doctor to demonstrate, That the Law of Moses or Covenant in Horeb was not onely the Rule and Dictate of what matter they should Covenant, but the express Covenant which was, or did consist in the exact recital, and Repetition of that Law of the ten Commandements, as the very form thereof; so as that they never varied or altered it, according to their special defections, in the particular points of their lies; and that this was the formal Government between God and the people in the times of Joshuab, and before Israels defection from God; or that this was the Covenant between God, the people, and King, and between the people and their King, in the dayes of Jehoiadab: Or that this was the express Covenant made in the point of the Sabbath, and the putting away strange wives in the times of Nebemiab. These several occasions, and special obligations, do bespeak them to have been Covenants, conformed as to the matter of them, to some part of the ten Commandements; but as to their forme and manner of expression, to have been square by themselves.

But whatever was the matter or form of their Covenanting,

I imagine it will not be denied, that *the taking or renewal thereof was their own political Act, done by their own will and power at the time, and on the occasion their own condition did require and dictate; and that many times without the content of the King then ruling them, and to our Covenant (warranted for matter by the Word of God) is by their example justified, to have been a pious and prudent action within our own power to perform, though for the form of it, it be not any Divine dictate, or Sovereign prescription, yet better to be esteemed, than the petty composition of a few politic men.*

Nor is there any strength in that; *we were not Apostatized to false and strange gods; unless he will affirm no defection short of Apostacy from the true, to false gods, is a sufficient ground or occasion on which to renew Covenant; which I think neither right reason or Religion will allow; shall not gradual defections be restrained, and total Apostacy be superseded by a reasonable Solemn League and Covenant? Surely then Jeshuah was too preposterous, in working Israel into Covenant with God, on a jealousy or rational conjecture of their future Apostacy; and had England no need to Covenant, when they were positing in doctrine, especially in worship and discipline, to Romes Superstition and Tyranny? Can any man consider the corruptions continued in England since the Reformation, and so defended, that nothing but a sovereign Remedy could remove them? nay, the very Retrogradations of the Reformation, by a return of many expelled Rites, and Prelatical power, and say, because she yet owned the true God, she had no need to Covenant? If covenanting be an Act within mans own power and choice; and defection from God and his ways inchoated or suspected be a just ground and occasion, Englands covenanting is fully fortified by Scripture and Reason, and the pretences thereof no way found fallacious.*

His last Suggestion in his indirect Answer is of no force; for admit that there is no precept or pattern for such a Covenant in all the New Testament (which directs us as Christians, and leaveth us to the Dictates of Nature, and discoveries of the Old Testament, in more publike and political Acts which concern us as a Kingdom, or Church National) or in the succeeding ages of the Church; Will it therefore follow, that such co-

venanting is sinful? the Primitive Churches never were of such extent in the enjoyment of such power, under such publique defections, and in such capacity of covenanting as we have been. Must we enquire what hath been done in the Christian Churches to do that and no more, without regard to what may be done, the condition of the Church requiring it? may not the very *Ligue de Saint* in France, and *Oath et cetera* in England, though sinful in their matter, be good Spurs and Directions in Christian-policy? May not the same means used to corroborate impiety, be lawfully and prudentially used to strengthen true Religion and Reformation? Why may not Popish policy teach Protestants to combine by Covenant, as Protestant piety and prudence did dictate to them a Confirmation in Religion by Catechising? Courses common to men are not to be condemned, because used by wicked men to wicked ends.

Baptismal Covenant, no bar to the Solemn League and Covenant.

None Sir, do deny the Covenant made in Baptisme to be the only new Evangelical Covenant to all Christians, broken by wilful and presumptuous sinnes, and renewed by repentance, and the participation of the Lords Supper: But it seemes unto me a strange transport of so grave and serious a Divine, to oppose it unto the Solemn League and Covenant (that piece of policy, rather than piety, as he is pleased to term it) The inconsistency of them I must confess is not to me visible; sure I am Baptismal Vows are no bar, but may be provocations to Solemn Covenanting to and with God; Let the matter of this Covenant be exactly scanned, and if it be in any one Article found repugnant to, or different from the Covenant made in Baptism, we will renounce the whole: I hope it will not be denied, that Baptized Nations and Churches may (in their publique and politique capacities) renew and amplifie that Covenant which was made in Baptisme: And truly Sir, the Solemn League and Covenant seems to me so little to differ from our Baptismal Covenant, that it is no hard matter to resolve it into those three grand Heads we are (instructed) were promised in our names when we were Baptized; and then all the difference will be in this; the Baptismal Covenant was personal and private; this publique and politique.

But

But I pray let us note his specification of the difference he suggesteth, and the reasons of this inconsistency he urgeth; which he supposeth to be a *μῆλα χάμα*, crying out, *How vastly different from this Sacred Covenant, this late piece of policy, more than piety is; and how little the true Covenant of a Christian binds him by his Baptisme or Repentance, or the Eucharist against all Episcopal Government, I leave all sober-minded Christians to judge.* Truly Sir, his universal particle *All*, may make something look like a *vast difference*, if we could but understand the *species* he would pitch upon, as excepted by his discrete term; but the uncertainty of the object is that we cannot but stumble at in all the conclusions of his suggested Answers: Methinks such an out-cry of *vast difference* should have been warranted by a clear *Antithesis*; Opposites cannot appear but by their opposition; and yet he specifies no one Article different from our Baptismal Covenant; but sophistically evades with an *How little do Baptisme repentance, or the Eucharist, bind against all Episcopal government:* These may Sir, very little binde against it, and yet the Covenant and they be at no *vast difference*; for the question is not, how little the true Covenant in them agitated binds against all Episcopal government; but how much it binds to any? He is the first Divine I have found to plead our Baptisme as the bond of Canonical obedience, and defence of Episcopacy; I never did imagine *Discipline and order* to be the expresse positive condition of *Baptisme*, and the *Christian Covenant thereby made qua Christian*, the only new Evangelical Covenant; but especially this *species* of it, *Episcopacy*. I hope his *jus divinum* will be made as clear as the Doctrine of the Trinity, whilst it is, and must be owned as the absolute condition of *Baptisme*, and nerve of *union with the Church*: Yet Sir, give me leave to tell the Doctor, if the late Hierarchy or Episcopacy of *England* (which he seems to advance as the late honour of the Ministry, and encouragement of *Learning and Religion*) be (as on an easie discussion it may be) found to be of the *Pomps and Vanities of this wicked world*; we are not only a little, but very much bound against it; for our God-fathers and God-mothers did promise in our behalf, *That we should forsake them, as the Devil, and all his works*; and then he may well imagine, all sober-minded

Christians must judge, there is a vast difference, between *Baptism* and such *Episcopacy*; and that he is acted with a strong zeal, that will by our Baptism bind unto it, who yet declared it to be but a tradition and universal observation.

Of the power
of ordination
by Bishops.

But he adds a Reason to enforce it, and that is, *Since both the power of ordaining Ministers, and by them to consecrate and celebrate both Sacraments, was ever derived from, and by Bishops of the Church, as the chief Conservators, Cisterns, and Conduits of all Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial power, from the very Apostles the first Bishops of the Church, Acts 1, &c.* But Sir, Is it determined and agreed on without controversy, that the power of Ordination was ever derived by and from Bishops (in his sence paternal Bishops) above, and distinct from Presbyters? that so it must be concluded No Ordination by Bishops, no Minister, no Consecration or Celebration of either Sacrament: And so where these *Conservators, Conduits, Cisterns* were never laid, or have been any way cut off, Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial Power never came, or is removed, and quite gone; for without doubt this water must run in its own Pipes; were it not for that subordination and dependance of ordinary *Ministers, Shepherds, and Rulers* unto, and upon the *Angels, Presidents, and chief Favers* of his Episcopal Authority he at after noteth; I should by his adjunct *Chief*, have conceived that he would grant, *Some small Pipes had run from the Apostles times in union with Christ our chief Bishop, and derived Ecclesiastical Authority, and Ministerial power in the vacancy of his Bishop; which, if he deny, the Church of Rome will triumph in his Episcopal union with her; but the Reformed Churches can give him little thanks for this Church annihilating Notion.*

Again, Is it clear that *Episcopal and Apostolical Ministry* is *idem ordo*, the same kind, distinct from that of *Pastors and Teachers*? it must be imagined so to be, whilst *Bishops* only as *Bishops*, lay so much claim to the *immediate succession to the Apostles*. That the Apostles had an *Episcopacy*, we cannot deny; for we read of it in *Acts 1. 20.* Nor I think can it be reasonably denied, that the *feeding-ruling Elders* at *Ephesus* were *Bishops*; for so Saint Paul called them, as consecrated by the Holy Ghost, *Acts 20. 28.* and immediate successors to the

the Apostles; yet it is not evident that they were all *Angels, Presidents, and chief Fathers*; and such as see *Timothy* over them as their Bishop, must needs deny them so to have been; and then Sir, some that wanted this paternal Authority, must be confessed *Cisterns of Ministerial Power, and Ecclesiastical Authority, and immediate Successors to the Apostles*; and so the Bond of Baptisme binds to *Gospel-Ministers*, as the *explicite and preceptive institution of Christ*; whilst *Episcopal order* can claim no more but *tradition*; and that very disputable; the Prelatical Divines of our Nation would not be thus tyed to the observation of the *Lords day*; nor I to the observation of *Easter*; yet both these (especially the first) look as like an *immediate institution of Christ, preceptive and explicite, or tacite and exemplary*; as any order or kinde of *Episcopacy* he suggesteth to be upheld by the bond of baptisme.

As to what the Doctor addeth concerning the *signal and intolerable injuries* offered to the persons of such excellent Bishops as England lately had, and still may have, and the *abatement of the honour of this whole Church and its Ministry, &c.* I wish it may be considered, That the Covenant is not levelled against any *Real Excellency* in the Bishops, but an *unwarrantable greatness, power, and authority*, assumed by them, or attributed to them; which conferred an unfitting honour on the Church, and then the exclusion of it is no injury; and the mighty *abatement* thereof is a positive duty: I cannot think but that *learning*, and the *due honour of the Church*, may and will be best encouraged by the vailing of that pompous, worldly state, and wicked superiority her Governours had obtained; the Churches *perspicuity* seems not to me so necessary, that it must needs shine in *Lawn Sleeves*, and succession of Bishops of *paternal Authority* over their brethren; nor know I to what Churches, save those of *Rome* (who make the Succession of their Bishops the sole and singular Note of the true Church) a *Supersedes* of such *Episcopal order* (how ancient or venerable soever it be deemed) can be so scandalous as is suggested; I am sure few of the Reformed Churches see cause so to judge it; and then Sir, we find little force in this his complicated Answer.

Thus Sir, I have made bold to consider the Doctors *indirect answer and arguments*, wherein he endeavoureth to shake and

subvert the whole Fabrick of the *Solemn League and Covenant*; and in them (to my judgement) there is so little strength of Reason, or true Religion, that it affords but a poor ground for his insulting and triumphant discharge in Page 13. *These things, being thus premised, are sufficient (as I conceive) to abate the Edge and Rigour of the Covenant, and to ravel that Cabel and Bond of Religious Obligation:* For Sir, notwithstanding his supposal (asserted) in good earnest there is neither Law of God or man requiring, imposing, or comprobing any such Covenant: The Boanergeses will find cause to thunder out terrour against Covenant-breaking, lest Rhetorical flourishes without strength of Reasons, should release the consciences of the vulgar from the power of Religious Bonds.

His direct answer.

It may be Sir, we shall find more strength in the Doctors down-right strokes, than in his back-blows: His batteries in his indirect answers attempted, have bespoken his purpose to break in sunder the Sacred Bond of the Covenant: His power to effect it in point of Episcopacy, must appear in his direct Answer; wherein (we thank him) he looks on the Covenant in the softest sense that can be made, as it is a *voluntary vow, or religious Bond, which private men spontaneously took upon themselves, &c.* But yet he suggesteth it was taken by *very few, not one fourth part of the Nation now living; and those few made to take it by the terrors of Prison, Plunder, Sequestration, and the like wracks:* Unto which (before we observe his particular reconciling Answers, relating to the special point of Episcopacy) I propound to consideration, that

The paucity of Covenanters will not discharge its obligation; be there never so few, I hope those few may be free in asserting, and must be faithful in adhering to the Covenant; in which their confidence may be the greater, for that His most Sacred Majesty comes in to make up the number.

But if the Doctor saw with my eyes, he would not suppose the number to be small; if all Tables were as legible as those of the Lords and Commons, I believe their number would be found many more than the fourth part of the Nation. But can any considerable observer take notice the Covenant was imposed on, and submitted unto, by all sorts and degrees of men, in all Counties, Cities, and Towns tendred (and since testified by their publick

publick subscriptions) by the most Ministers in the several Counties, unto their individual Congregations, and that under the success of War, which usually extendeth a Covenant unto all who come under its influence, and yet (without the supposal of a very great mortality) imagine, *not the fourth part of the Nation* to have taken the Covenant: The Doctor sure judgeth by such with whom he converseth; and I easily believe they are not a fourth part of the Nation; yet methinks he himself being to be reckoned into the number, might well conjecture them to be more.

But again Sir, the *capacity* of the Covenanters is more considerable than *the number*; and will make it a question well worth consideration, Whether it be not obligatory to the whole Nation? When I consider the Lords and Commons *in Parliament assembled*; and under that notion and capacity swearing the Covenant, as the collective body of the Nation, though not near *a fourth part in number*; I am apt to think it looks very like a *National Obligation*: For I know not how they can take pardons, if they may not make promises in our names; especially when the assent of His *Most Sacred Majesty* is made so legible by His Royal Subjection to the same Solemn League and Covenant. I am much mistaken if the Oath of *Zedekiah* and the *Princes* (without popular delegates) did not bind the people of *Israel*: I hope the Doctor will be more wary, than to plunge the whole Kingdom into perjury: That there was any such Logick as *Prisons, Plunder, and Sequestrations*, to enforce the Covenant, I am not well-pleased; I hope he had more fortitude than to suffer his Reason and Religion to be so captivated, he knoweth the *will cannot be compelled*; and I imagine he will not make *extortion by force*, any more than *fraud* absolve the Obligation, and warrant the recession or violation of an Oath; he knows that Nature and Scripture do teach the contrary, whatever was *Cicero's* affection to him, he knows wherein he commends *Pomponius* the Tribune as to his extorted Oath; nor will a Casuist deny, *Juramentum metu extortum*, to bind; greater *force* can besiege none to the *making of an Oath*; nor greater *fury* from God follow any for *breaking the Oath* so forced, than that which befell *Zedekiah* to the King of *Babylon*.

But

But let us see by what strength of Reason he worketh our release from this *voluntary vow*, that we also may be free-men; and it is produced by several suggestions; whereof

Words in oaths
do bind.

The first is a clear sophism or charm to vulgar conception; *They are not* (saith he) *the bare words of the Covenant, which as charms, can binde any mans conscience to, or against anything:* It is very true; for they may be historically read, or repeated by such who are not capable of, or concerned in the obligation: But Sir, if (as in our case) the words be uttered as expressions of the mind, and declarations of the purpose and resolve of the heart to engage God and men to expectation of performance, I hope they then binde; and that, not only because the matter is *just, true, and good*, but also because *declared*: Is not engagement of expectation in others unto the Obligation of our selves *the end of speech* in Promises and Oaths? whence else is that Caution of Casuists, That *the words of an oath be plain, and clear, and commonly used and understood*, that the fallacy thereof may fall? I wonder at the Doctors Antithesis of words unto Reason, Justice, Truth, Religion, and Duty, which we deny not *morally and really to oblige men either by Gods general or particular precepts*: but yet I cannot believe them to be as Iron or Adamantine bands to cluse good and do it; to hate evil and shew it, long before the Withs and Cords of mans combining or tying are put upon them by themselves or others: This sounds in my ears like new Divinity, and morality too; oh the folly of Nations, who confide more in the Withs and Cords of words, promises, Covenants, than in the Iron and Adamantine bonds of Truth, Justice, and Duty? I must confess, I was so foolish, as to fancy myself bound to an *As*, because *good, just, true, duty*; but much faster bound, because *promised or sworne*; and I have known many men boyle at an Oath or Promise, and fear to break it, who would make no bones of Reason, Truth, Justice, Duty, but snap them in sunder like a singletie; and methinks the Scripture placeth a great deal of strength in the words of a Vow or Oath, *Dent. 23. 23. That which is gone out of thy lips thou shalt keep and performe, as thou hast vowed it willingly unto the Lord thy God; for thou hast spoken it with thy mouth:* And sure there was most Adamantine strength in the words of *Jephthah*, which put him into

into that agony, and constrained that out-try, *I have opened my mouth unto the Lord; and cannot go back* ? Judges 11. 35. If Oaths and Promises are but *Wishes and Cords*, I marvel at the course and customes of Nations to lay them each on other, as the only grounds of confidence; and I much more wonder, mens faith should be more fixed in Gods Promises, than Properties; and God, though under the *Iron bonds* of his own mercy, justice, truth; yet, for assurance sake, should bring himself under the *Wishes and Cords* of Promise and Oath, and then tell us by two immutable things wherein it is impossible God should lie; we should have strong consolation, Hebr. 6. 18.

His second suggestion is to me no less strange than the first; (*viz.*) *Nor can any such Covenant bind any man in any conscientious bond, merely by the power of a mans own imagination*: I am sure it can never bind him by the power of another mans imagination. Oaths ought to be in words significant, whose sense may be obvious to every common capacity; shutting and shutting the sense, and signification of an Oath, is the snare and perplexity of Conscience, policy of Hell, and Sophistry of the Devil: Men must be careful to understand every Religious Tie and Bond; and not *list to conceive by prejudice and presumption*; yet if his own imagination be not that which must guide and bind him, I am mistaken; I expect men to see with their own eyes, and be saved by their own faith; and did ever conceive discourse, interpretation, instruction, and argumentation, to intend, not a *Magistrial Imposition*, but information of the mind, which might engender a right imagination for men to follow. I know not Sir, what your Cause may make of an *Erroneous Conscience*; but Dr. Am's hath taught us, *Conscientia quamvis errans, semper ligat*; & *ille peccat qui agit contra Conscientiam*; an erroneous Conscience doth alwayes bind, so that he sins, who acts contrary thereunto; which cannot be, unless the Covenant bind by the power of a mans own imagination.

His third Answer I do confess is drawn with some considerable strength; for *no Covenant can bind us to the injury of another's Right, Liberty, Power, or lawful Authority, private or publick*; except such as are *sui juris*, involved in himself; and *so per accidens*, are hindered, and hurt in and by them, which I believe

believe he understands: but Sir, it loseth its strength in the assumption; for it appears not that the extirpation of *Prclacy* as it is expressed in the Covenant, doth take away the liberty, power, and lawfull authority of King, Bishops, or Parliament; himself tells us, the Covenant was levelled against the *despoticum tyrannicum Regimen*; and I have before noted, that it is the unwarrantable pomp and power, and unlawful authority, and superiority of the Bishops above other Ministers, which is excluded, and to be extirpated by the Covenant, untill the Object is agreed on, the force of this Argument may well fall.

Yet give me leave to tell the Doctor, it is worth his enquiry, whether the power of the King for *restitution*, and of the Bishops for *execution and administration* of *Episcopacie* (lately acted in England, and nowv endeavoured to be restored) be not fully, and actually, by a just, lawfull, and compleat Authority, *abolished* and taken away by the statute of 17 *Caroli*, repealing that whole branch of the statute *primo Elizabethæ*, which authorized the jurisdiction of *Episcopacy*; and barieth his most sacred Majesty from giving Commissions therunto, and forbidding all Ranks and Orders Ecclesiastical from acting upon any such Commission, in any matter or thing whatsoever: Sir, most men think that this power was lawful, and the Hierarchy of England, was *sui juris* to, and within the power of King, Lords, and Commons; and this discharge of *Episcopacy* to have been no injury, and to have been acted long before the Covenant did exist; and so the Covenant was but an enforcement of this Law; and then Sir, if there be a Parliament which may look upon Bishops and *Episcopacy* with a more propitious eye, than those who beheld it through the Presbyterian spectacles, it will be worth enquiry, whether the Covenant (as is before noted) be not a National Covenant, and bindeth not the Parliament from propounding, and praying, and his most sacred Majesty from assenting unto the re-establishment thereof? and so whether the present *actings* of some Bishops and Deans be not without Legal and just authority; and the imposing or endeavouring to return that (by Statute) abolished, and (by Covenant) excluded Fabrick, be not a transgression of the Law, and plunging the Nation into perjury? which how consistent it is with the honour of King or Kingdom, let wise men judge.

The

The Doctors fourth, fifth, and eighth Suggestions do relate unto the good of *Episcopacie*; concerning which, he supposeth a good, which I must confess I am not clear to admit; as for that good in this, which is common to all Governments (*viz.*) the Principles and proportions of Order, Subordination, and Government, we shall not deny it, only conceive it is not here pleadable; for, it may be continued in the Government which shall be established; but - as to that of good in it, by Scriptural Precepts and Patterns in the Jewish Church, Apostolique constitution, and Primitive use of Ecclesiastical custome, and holymens general approbation, and universal imitation, it is under dispute, and not yet obvious, and so not of force to conclude for it; and as to Englands experience of the much good done by it, since the Reformation, it is very obscure, whilst the best of benefit imaginable to have been reaped by it, hath been to preserve the Reformation in the state and degree in which King Edward the sixth, and Queen Elizabeth left it; for wherein hath *Episcopacie* promoted it? nay, rather wherein hath not *Episcopacie* (by its silencing and suspending zealous Ministers, excommunicating, imprisoning, banishing, and stigmatizing pious Christians, for no fault at all save endeavouring it) retarded the progress and perfection of the Reformation? nay, hath not *Episcopacie* (by its turning our Chancels into raised infantia sanctorum, our Communion-tables into adred Altars, our glass windows into popish pictures, and changing our common and established Liturgy into a more compleat conformity to the Popish Maske for form of administration, Order of worship, Rites and Ceremonies) brought the Reformation into a most palpable and apparent Retrogradation? and hath not then your Doctor cause to tell us it were extreame folly, and madness, prophaneness, and blasphemy to cry it down as evill, and engage in Covenant against it as such? truly Sir, to all his supposed good whereby it is so beneficial (in his eye) to the being, compleat and regular being of any Church, and none more than England, I shall only oppose that one evill, for which (we e therein it no more) it deserveth to be decried, and extirpated by the Covenant, and that evill I find so inherent to *Episcopacy*, that this very moderate man cannot divide them, (*viz.*) the not only degrading all ordinary Pastors and Ministers in the sight of the people (making their Ministry greatly ineffectual (but also divesting them of all authority, and superiority over the people, preferring the people to, and above them, as their equals and superiours; whereby all their administrations whilst in black Coats; are represented to be meer Cyphers, to

The goodness of *Episcopacy* denied.

which the Bishops *Lawn sleeves* must be the only figure significant: Sir, can it be less than duty, to extirpate that which doth engross to its self, and so enervate in others, all Gospel Ministry? if *Cephas* and *Apollo* be not *Ministers of Jesus Christ*, as well as *Paul the Apostle*, I see no cause to chide the *Corinthians* for their Schisme; but passing his Hypothesis, let us try the strength of his Propositions by which he would bind the Covenanter to his Episcopacy, and they sound very strangely in my ears.

Oaths may bind against good indifferent.

1. *A Covenant can bind no man in conscience against any thing that is in its nature good, or not Morally evil, for this were to bind a mans self and others beyond Gods eternal righteousness; this is unto me a lesson of new Divinity; for Sir, be pleased to note, that the good he speaks of is natural, not moral, much less Theological good; it is a good which is not in it self necessary, but may be necessary in its time and place; so that it is a plain Adiaphoron, a thing indifferent: that to bind men to what is morally evil, is a Covenant of hell, I can easily be convinced; but, that to bind them against what is allowed of God as good and lawful (but not duty necessary untill circumstanced with time and place) should be so, is sure but one Doctors opinion. I did ever conceive Adiaphorons to be subject to the Magistrates command, and a mans own Covenant, and so distinct from Divine prescription; the eating of flesh is in its nature good, and not morally evil; the Apostle is apt to Covenant with a weak brother never to eat flesh; is this to bind himself beyond Gods eternal bonds of righteousness, or in a Covenant with hell? I mistake such Casuists as I have read, if they conclude not the contrary.*

Oaths against evil hindring the use of some good, do binde.

2. *No man may vow or Covenant, much lesse keep any such Covenant as be bath taken intentionally against the evil, corruption or abuse of any thing, so as to involve the good and usefulness of it, and to condemn that to destruction and extirpation. Truly Sir, I must confess not only judicial (such as is his instance of the Jndg. of all the earth in his righteous distribution towards Sodom, and so impertinent to his case) but also rational, and Religious discrimination of objects is good, and necessary, but that a Covenant involving good and usefulness, whilst it is intended against evil and abuse, is therefore void, and not to be kept, I cannot believe: I have read, *juramentum non esse illicitum aut obligandi vim non amittere præcise ab hoc, quod videtur esse impeditivum majoris boni*, an oath is not therefore void, because it hinders a greater (that is, more than simple) good: I shall willingly wish men may not be so transported as to swear against a good when it can be separated from the*

Sanderfon de juramento præleſ. 3. Sect. 12.

the evil; nor yet to *discharge the Oath*; because the good (which might have been divided) is involved: It is a mans duty to distinguish between the *Superstructures of men, and foundation of Christ and his Apostles* (of which order his Episcopacy doth not yet appear:) And it is a mans liberty to restrain himself from the thing that is in its own nature good and useful, when attended with plain and positive, nay, accidental evil. I knew a man passing through an old rotten house, got a knock on his pate, and in his passion, swore he would pull it down and burn it every stick; his work-men advised him to use some of the materials good and useful in his new Fabrick; the good man is conscious of his Oath (though rash and unadvised) Will the Doctor please to resolve his conscience? Or again, *Hezekiah* observes the brazen serpent (the sometimes means, and now Memorial of *Israels* remedy, and type of the Redeemer) abused to Idolatry, sweareth he will destroy it, and accordingly executes his Oath: Suppose it at that time (as it had its good) to be as useful as before, it will puzzle me to charge him with iniquity for so doing.

Thirdly, "No man can in conscience be bound by any such Covenant against that which may upon second thoughts and after-view, and better information, appear to be good and useful to him; he is here bound not to keep his Covenant in the latitude of his mistakes and presumptions, nor to act according to his prejudices and former supposals, but rather to retract his rashness and unadvisedness in taking it at first, and to act according to his present evidence of what is true, just, good, lawful, and useful, even in Episcopacy, &c. Truly Sir, this is to me such strange divinity, that I cannot but wonder D.D. should be attendant on the assertor of it; I am sure if it be admitted, one reason produced by no mean Casuist to defend the Obligation of an Oath extorted by fear, must fall to the ground, *Elegit id quod tunc visum est sibi melius*, he chose that which he then conceived to be the best; but according to our Casuist, he might on an after-view discern hurtful, and so retract: How happy and cheering would such a resolution as this have been unto *Jephthah* in his anguish and out-cry, *I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and cannot go back!* Why man, can you not on second thoughts and an after-view see the goodness and usefulness of your daughter? Retract the rashness and unadvisedness of thy vow; and act according to thy present evidence; Nay, how advantageous had this resolution been to *Israel*, when *Joshuah* and the Princes preserved the *Gibeonites* to be pricks in the eyes, and thorns in the side of *Israel*? To what end do they plead, *We have sworn an-*

He that sweareth to his own hurt, is bound.

Sander. de Juran. Left. 4 Sect 15.

to them by the Lord, now therefore we may not touch them? Why, must they needs act to the latitude of their presumptions & mistakes? could they not on second thoughts and after view discover their craft, and discern them to be of the people commanded by God to be destroy'd, dangerous to disturb their peace, and divert them from their Religion? How sad was the fate of the sons of Saul in the want of such a solution as this which might have saved them all from hanging? for the Scripture witnesseth, That Saul slew the Gibeonites in his zeal to the children of Israel and Judah, 2 Sam. 21. 2. Without doubt on second thoughts and an after-view of the good which might ensue on the violation of that Covenant caught by fraude, I hope, our Prelates will take care in the next Impression of the Common-Prayer-Book, to make the words in *Psal. 15. ver. 5.* conform to *Psal. 105. ver. 28.* it is but the expunction of a Negative particle, and for *disobedient*, we reade *obedient*; and for *repenteſt not*, we reade *repenteſt*; and so the Character of a man for heaven shall be conform to our Casuists resolution and Scriptvre-Text, *He that sweareth to his owne hurt, and repenteth*: I cannot but commend the correction of this verse to the Drs. care; for as it is now read, it is not onely different from the Original, but also dissonant to his doctrine whilſt it is read in the Old Common-prayer-Book, *He that sweareth to his neighbour, and disappointeth him not, though it were to his own hindrance.*

Thus Sir, I have tryed the strength of the Drs. Arguments; and find in them very little force to rectifie conscience, release St. Peter, and reconcile the Covenant with Episcopacy. Truly Sir, were Episcopacy in it self never so good, yet it must appear necessary before it break through the bond of the Covenant: It is now indeed *high time to learn righteousness and wisdom*: the which works not more in any thing, than a conscientious cleaving to the Covenant, and paying the vows made to God in the day of affliction: I freely consent with him, that the cautious and conscientious covenanters take a calmer view, and exaſter meaſure than perhaps he did at the first. But methinks he should not leave them to rules of so great latitude, that will not only discharge the Covenant, but all Sacred Religious ties: What Oaths can bind, if words are of no force, or but withs and cords? his owne imagination of no influence? no good may be excluded or involved? and second thoughts discovering usefulness will discharge it? where shall be the certainty of humane contracts or force of Religious bonds, if these principles be admitted? who shall ever scruple to make, or care to keep a Covenant, if other mens interpretations must direct it, and our own retraction

tion on *sence of rashness*, may discharge it? If Sir, these Propositions be the Doctors props for Episcopacy, it will appear too prophane for pious men to meddle with.

Sir, I doubt not but he and all men shall find every conscientious Covenanter enjoy the comfort of his *accomplished Oath*, when in his place he hath *seasonably advised*, *humbly petitioned*, and *lawfully endeavoured*, to remove Englands old Hierarchy; and to restore such an Episcopacy, to be exercised by the Officers of the Church in Common, and good order, as is rearest the Scripture, Primitive practice and persuasion of sober, grave, pious, and learned men, such as was the late Primate of Armagh, but if either His *Most Sacred Majesty*, or any other in Authority fail in the exercise of their capacity (as the late perfidious Rump in their traitorous and uncharitable Declaration of September 20. 1650. maliciously suggested, he would, and as he seems to hope) to effect the ends of the Covenant, I hope it shall be no offence to mourn for their iniquity, and the iniquity of the Land; nor will it be inconsistent to that *humble submission*, active or passive, I confess we all owe unto his Most Sacred Majesty; whatever shall be the establishment in the Church (though never so corrupt, yet) whilst consistent with salvation, though it may occasion to me *suffering*, and a *uspence of my Ministry*, by Gods grace it shall not effect in me, or touch on whom I have an influence. *Schism* from the Church, or *Resistance* of his Majesties just Right and Authority; for whom as I have not suffered the least, so if God should so farre leave Him (which God forbid) I am ready by him to suffer the utmost, in adherence to the *Solemn League and Covenant*, untill it be discovered a *band of iniquity*, a *snare and gin for Schisme and Sedition* to act by to the *dishonour of God*, and *reproach of Reformed Religion*: Yet I cannot but most heartily pray for the *best and ingenious Reformation of Episcopacy beyond the former defective or excessive Constitution or execution of it*; which I doubt not will effect the corruption and extirpation covenanted.

I confess every conscientious Covenanter oweth this Justice and duty.

1. To God, "to approve, love, desire, and use *what is good*, nor being within his own power, and excluded by his Oath or Covenant; may, and must, are things very different.

2. "To obey the King as chief Governour of Church and State enjoining things *lawful and honest* (so not Covenanted against) though not the very best.

3. To pity "the Bishops and Fathers of the Church who have been there too injurious, or in *unjustly used*, and pull down all proud Prelates and paternal Authority over Presbyters, which abuse their brethren, and debase their Ministry, because in a black Coat.

4. To encourage Ministers, and endeavour the *rescue of them from dividing Factions and popular infolencies* which have befallen them for want of the King, and Ecclesiastica Order, but may be enjoyed without a Bishop advanced in power above his Brethren.

5. Love to the Church, in endeavouring its *unity, peace, and prosperity* in the ruine of Prelacy and establishment of an Episcopacy and oversight duly constituted and carefully executed.

6. Care to his own soul, *inward and eternal peace*, not to be couzened by glosses, courted by Rhetorical flourish, nor cudgelled out of his Covenant by most bitter sufferings, but to cleave unto it with care, constancy, and diligence, and take heed of all sophistical solutions, and subtle reconciliations, which endeavour to baffle the Covenant, and break in pieces the very power of Religious bonds.

Sir,

Sir, Knowing how tender and delicate a thing Conscience is, yet fearing it might be baffled and deluded by Sophistry undiscovered; I have presumed to sur-
 veigh your Doctors Solution of the Covenant, and give an account of my apprehen-
 sions of it; Covenant-breaking is so direful a God-provoking sin, that I tremble
 to think of Englands least tendencie to it; whatever men fancie to themselves of
 the Covenant being the Rock of his late Majesties shipwraik, it is visible that the
 violation of it hath been the destruction of our late Usurpers, who laid it aside that
 they might leap into their Chair of State: and it cannot be denied to have been
 the chief and only means of his Majesties most just and honourable Restitution;
 and an adherencie to it (I doubt not) will prove the establishment of his Royal
 Throne; I cannot therefore but be grieved to finde contempt poured on the Cove-
 nant, not only by the vulgar, but such whose ranck and gravity should make them
 more sensible of the weight and worth of an Oath.

When Sir your Doctors Solution came first into my hands, the Speech of Julian
 Cardinal of Saint Angelo concerning the League of Wladislavus King of Hungary
 with Amurath the Turk, came into my memory; and one observation seems too
 much alike unto it (I pray you pardon the comparison) the pretended principle of the
 one was Zeale for the Church, and love of Religion; and so of the other; the scrpe
 of the one was to discharge the Oath, and so of the other: the method of the one
 was to absolve by colour and pretence of binding under the Oath; so of the other: the
 Arguments of the one were defect of authority from Gods Vicar on earth, consent of
 Confederates, contrariety to former Covenants, exclusion of greater good, exposal to
 reproach and scandal, rashnesse and unwisdomnesse in making, and the like; and such
 are the arguments of the other: the one was by a man of eminencie, and esteeme,
 and engaged in the same Oath; so is the other: such is Sir the agreement in every
 point, that it would much better have become a Jesuite or Popish Cardinal than a
 Protestant Doctor. I cannot but pray they may not agree in their intended end, the
 breach of the Covenant; lest God make them agree in the miserable effect, the losse
 of the Christian Cause, ruine of King and people, and their perpetual infamy.

I shall Sir trouble you no longer, save to tell you this answer was dispatched in
 two days; and had waited on you much sooner, but that I hoped some more eminent
 and able pen would have pleaded the Cause of the Covenant, and matched the
 Doctor suitably to himself; such as it is you now have it; I desire it may be weigh-
 ed in the ballance of Reason and Religion, without respect unto the person; who
 by his meannesse and many calumnies (which yet he wearth as his crown) is ob-
 noxious to no little prejudice; but if he prove a Taylors Goose, hot and heavie, but
 blinde and dark, will be contented to wear the Cap; whilst resolved to approve
 himself no lesse zealous in the Religious than he hath appeared in the Political or
 Civil part of the Solemne League and Covenant; and make it his care to give God
 the things that are Gods, as Caesar the things that are Caesars.

SIR,

Farewell, be faithful.

July 8th.
 1660.

8

W

F

7
 22

